

## REMARKS

### **Summary**

Claims 1-6 were pending and all of the claims were rejected in the Office action. Claims 1, 3 and 4 have been amended; Claims 2, 5 and 6 have been cancelled; and new Claim 7 has been introduced. No new matter has been added. The Applicant has carefully considered the references and reasons advanced by the Examiner and respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the amendments and the discussion presented below.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 4 has been objected to on the basis of a minor informality and has been amended to conform to the interpretation set forth by the Examiner.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC §102 (e) as being anticipated by Wang (US 6,041,413: "Wang413"). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 2, 5, and 6, which claims have been cancelled.

Since dependent Claims 5 and 6 were not rejected as anticipated on the basis of the reference, they must logically contain material not anticipated by the reference. Incorporation of the subject matter of these claims into Claim 1, thus obviates any anticipation rejection based on the reference cited. As set forth below, Claim 1 is also not obvious with respect to the references cited.

Claim 3 is allowable, without more, as a claim dependent on an allowable independent claim.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Wang413 in view of Wang (US 6,275,947: "Wang947"); Claims 5 and 6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wang413 and Gudan et.al. (US 6,256,682: "Gudan"). Claims 5

and 6 have been cancelled, their subject matter having been incorporated into Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a startup unit having a differential amplifier.

This limitation is not found or suggested in any of the references, and therefore Claim 1 is not obvious. Claim 4 is allowable as a claim dependent on now allowable Claim 1.

### **New Claim**

New Claim 7 is independently allowable.

Claim 7 recites “ [a] computer power supply startup apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein the auxiliary power supply comprises a rechargeable battery.”

Support for this subject matter is found on page 5 lines 19-23. The arrangement of Claim 7 has the advantage of minimizing the power dissipation when the main power supply is turned off. A typical current requirement would be 500 microamperes (0.0005 amperes) at 5 VDC (specification, page 9, line 7), whereas the conventional ATX power supply can fan out 0.7 amperes (Wang413, column 2, lines 5-10). The references cited either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest the subject matter.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 3-4 and 7 are allowable.

### **Conclusion**

Claims 1, 3-4 and 7 are pending.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 46,193  
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200